

Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction

Solutions: Chapter 2

Mrinank Sharma

March 26, 2020

Exercise 2.1 ϵ -Greedy Action Selection

$$\Pr[\text{greedy action selected}] = \epsilon \cdot \frac{1}{2} + (1 - \epsilon) \quad (1)$$

$$= \frac{3}{4} \quad (2)$$

Exercise 2.2 Bandit Example

The exploratory action could have occurred on any of the timesteps (and the behaviour could have coincidentally given us the sequence of actions). However, the action **must** have occurred on timesteps 2 and 5 since the greedy action was not selected.

Exercise 2.3 Infinite Horizon Performance

In the long run, assume that the sample averages have converged to the correct values or close enough for the exploratory cases. There is no guarantee of this happening for the purely greedy strategy. Then, the probability of selecting the right action is 0.99 and 0.9 for $\epsilon = 0.01$ and $\epsilon = 0.1$ respectively and from the graph, about $\frac{1}{3}$ for the purely greedy example.

The greedy algorithm seems to average about 1 reward on each timestep (I'm sure there are mathematical reasons for this). So, in the long run, it would have cumulative reward T . The *expected value* of a purely exploratory action is 0, since the arm means are drawn from a $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ distribution. As a result, in the long run:

$$\text{expected cumulative reward}_{\epsilon=0.01} = 0.99 \cdot 1.55 \cdot T \quad (3)$$



$$\text{expected cumulative reward}_{\epsilon=0.1} = 0.9 \cdot 1.55 \cdot T \quad (4)$$

Exercise 2.4 Changing Step Sizes

Note: might have got the indices slightly confused here!

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{n+1} &= Q_n + \alpha_n [R_n - Q_n] \\ &= \alpha_n R_n + (1 - \alpha_n) Q_n \\ &= \alpha_n R_n + (1 - \alpha_n) \alpha_{n-1} R_{n-1} + (1 - \alpha_n)(1 - \alpha_{n-1}) Q_{n-1} \\ &\vdots \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \alpha_{n-i} R_{n-i} \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} (1 - \alpha_{n-j}) + Q_1 \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} (1 - \alpha_{n-i}) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Exercise 2.5 Programming



As expected, the sample mean method does not work so well. I expect it to get worse as more time goes on, but it still seems to do reasonably well.

Exercise 2.6 Mysterious Spikes

The spikes only occur for the optimistic, greedy method even though we've averaged across 2000 different bandit problems.

The algorithm has wildly too high initial values. This effectively means that for the first ten steps, the algorithm will explore every single option. After the 10th step, the algorithm will greedily pick the best option. This is most likely to be the true best option. However, eventually it will pick this option enough times that it no longer looks like the true best option (since the other estimates values are all too high). It will then pick those options until their value drops, and this keeps repeating.

This sort of behaviour won't get smoother as we randomise more. We are always dealing with updates from small numbers of rewards with poor initial values and as a result, the estimated value for each of the arms will be changing most at the start, meaning that there will be oscillations in the optimal action selected.

I'm not particularly convinced by this answer.

Exercise 2.7: Unbiased Constant Step Size Trick

Since $\bar{o}_0 = 0$, $\bar{o}_1 = \alpha$ so it is clear that $Q_2 = R_1$. Therefore, there is no initial bias.

We need to show that the remaining terms form an weighted average. Let's go back to our previous formula. Doing some relabeling, we can write Q_{n+1} as:

$$Q_{n+1} = \sum_{i=1}^n R_i \beta_i \prod_{j=i+1}^n (1 - \beta_j). \quad (6)$$

We want to show that the coefficients form a weighted average. It is easy to see that:

$$\beta_i = \frac{1}{\sum_{j=0}^{i-1} (1-\alpha)^j}. \quad (7)$$

$\beta_i > 0 \forall i$ and $\beta_i > \beta_{i+1}$. We want to show that:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \prod_{j=i+1}^n (1-\beta_j) = 1. \quad (8)$$

We now show that the coefficients sum to 1 by proof by induction. Consider the case $n = 1$. Clearly the coefficients sum to 1, since $\beta_1 = 1$. Now, assume that the above holds for $n = n^*$. Then,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n^*+1} \beta_i \prod_{j=i+1}^{n^*+1} (1-\beta_j) = \beta_{n^*+1} + (1-\beta_{n^*+1}) \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^{n^*} \beta_i \prod_{j=i+1}^{n^*} (1-\beta_j)}_1 = 1 \quad (9)$$

If true for n , true for $n+1$. Since true for $n = 1$, true for all positive integers. Thus we have a exponentially weighted average with no initial bias.